

REMARKS

Claims 1, 18, and 32 have been amended to clarify that the recited system is a “stand alone” system, and these claims and the associated dependent claims do not require that the injection/loading system actually be connected to the FCC unit or otherwise include the presence of the FCC unit. Accordingly, dependent claims 2, 13, and 14 have also been amended. Claims 61 and 76 have also been amended to clarify the same feature.

Claims 61 and 76 have also been amended to clarify the same feature.

Claim 1 has also been amended to further define the invention recited therein with subject matter recited in dependent claim 12 and intervening claim 6. Claims 6 and 12 have been canceled.

Claim 18 has been amended to further define Applicants' invention. Briefly, the invention recited in claim 18 is further defined as comprising (3) plurality of load cells for measuring a weight of the loading unit and the catalyst and/or additives in the loading unit, (4) a manifold for placing the loading unit in fluid communication with at least two storage bins for storing catalyst and/or additive on a selective basis, and (5) a controller capable of receiving inputs from the load cells in order to monitor the weight of the loading unit and weight of the catalyst and/or additive from one or more of storage bins. Feature (3) is recited in original claim 22, which is now being canceled. Support for feature (4) is found in Paragraphs [46] and [54] of Applicants' specification, and given the same feature has been recited in claim 30, claim 30 is being canceled. Feature (5) is found in Paragraphs [74], [85], and [98] of Applicants' specification.

Claim 28 is amended to reflect the amendments requested in Claim 18 regarding the locations, of the loading unit and the recited storage bin.

Claim 32 is being amended to include subject matter originally recited in dependent claim 81 and intervening dependent claim 80. Accordingly, claims 80 and claim 81 are being canceled.

Claims 82-84, originally dependent on claims 80 and/or 81, have been amended to reference claim 32.

Claim 59 has been amended to incorporate subject matter originally recited in claim 1 (but amended to address the §112 rejection discussed below) and intervening dependent claim 58. Accordingly claim 58 is being canceled. Claim 1 has been maintained in amended form as described above.

Claims 62 and 63, which originally were dependent on claim 58, are being amended to reference claim 59.

Claim 74 is being amended to include subject matter from original independent claim 18 (but amended to address the §112 rejection discussed below), and intervening dependent claims 73 and 30. Accordingly, claims 30 and 73 are being canceled. Claim 18 has been maintained in amended form as described above.

Claim 77, originally dependent on claim 73, has been amended to reference claim 74.

Independent claims 46 and 57 have also been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 47-56 and claims 68-70 stand withdrawn as directed to non-elected inventions.

§112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 1, 18 and 32 have been rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. It is stated in the Office Action that it is not clear in these claims whether a FCC unit is included as a

component in the systems recited in these claims. Applicants have proposed amendments in claims 1, 18, and 32 to clarify that these claims recite a “stand alone” system and that these independent claims and the associated dependent claims do not require that the injection/loading system actually be connected to the FCC unit or otherwise include the presence of the FCC unit. For example, these claims have all been amended to recite that the system is “*adapted to be*” in fluid communication with the FCC unit, rather than “being” in fluid communication. Other amendments to these claims, and to certain of the dependent claims as appropriate, are directed to this same concept. See, for example, the amendment to dependent claim 12, specifying that the vacuum producer of the loading unit is “adapted to be” in fluid communication with a source of pressurized air (such as would be available at a refinery), rather than actually “being” in fluid communication.

Claim 23 had been rejected because of a lack of antecedent basis for load cells. Claim 23 is dependent on Claim 18, and Claim 18 now recites a plurality of load cells to provide antecedent basis for the load cells recited in claim 23. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112, second paragraph, rejection in light of the aforementioned amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

It was indicated in the Office Action that the subject matter of claims 12, 13, 59-61, 63-67, 74-79, and 81-85 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the aforementioned §112, second paragraph, rejection, and to incorporate the subject matter of the claims on which they are dependent.

Claim 12, dependent on claim 1, and intervening claim 6, was deemed allowable because the prior art does not disclose or adequately teach a controller electrically coupled to a plurality of load cells, and the respective actuators of the recited valves. The subject matter of claims 6 and 12 has been incorporated into now-amended claim 1.

Claim 13 (originally dependent on claim 12) has been amended to reference amended claim 1.

Claim 59-61, 74-79, and 81-85 were deemed allowable because the prior art does not disclose or adequately teach the pipe guide configurations recited in these claims.

Accordingly, claim 59, dependent on claim 58, and claim 1, has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of the latter two claims. Claims 60 and 61 remain dependent on claim 59.

Accordingly, Claim 74, dependent on claims 73, 30, 29, and independent claim 18, has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 18 and 73, the latter of which directly relates to the pipe guide configuration. It is submitted, however, that since the subject matter of claims 29 and 30 are related to a manifold and storage bins, it is not necessary to include the subject matter of these intervening claims in claim 74. Claims 75-79 remain dependent on claim 74.

Since claim 81 is dependent on claim 80 and claim 32, claim 32 has accordingly been amended to incorporate the subject matter of the former two claims. Claims 82-85, dependent on claim 81, have been amended to be dependent on claim 32.

Claim 18

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of independent claim 18, and claims dependent thereon, in light of the amendments requested above and remarks below.

Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Freeman (US 4,005,908). Claim 18 has been amended to recite a catalyst and/or additive storage and loading system comprising a manifold capable of placing the loading unit of the system in fluid

communication with at least two storage bins for storing catalyst and/or additive on a selective basis, and a controller capable of receiving inputs from the load cells of the system in order to monitor the weight of the loading unit and weight of the catalyst and/or additive from one or more of storage bins. Freeman only discloses a single source of material to be handled by his system, and Freeman does not disclose a controller that monitors the unit's weight of catalyst being sourced from more than one storage bin. It is therefore submitted that Freeman does not anticipate the subject matter of amended claim 18.

Claim 18 has also been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Reuter (US 3,632,173) in view of Markham (US 3,591,525). It is respectfully submitted that the disclosures in both of these references are limited to units handling or processing particulate material from a single source and therefore do not disclose or suggest the aforementioned manifold and controller features now recited in claim 18. It is therefore submitted that Applicants invention is not suggested by Reuter in view of Markham.

It is noted that US Patent 4,301,880 to Krambrock has been referenced in the Office Action with respect to other claims reciting a manifold for two or more sources of particulate. It is respectfully submitted, however, that Krambrock does not disclose employing a manifold in the context of a controller that is connected to load cells to monitor weight of the unit and catalyst and/or additive from two or more sources of catalyst and/or additive being drawn through the manifold.

Remaining independent Claims 46 and 57 that were rejected in the March 30, Office Action have been canceled. Cancellation of these claims and all other claims are made without prejudice to Applicants' right to re-present the claims in a continuing application.

Double Patenting

The claims of the instant application, except claims 59-61, 63-67, 71-72, 74-79, and 81-85, have been provisionally rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness type double

patenting as being unpatentable over certain claims of copending Application No. 10/806,563, with claims 58, 62, 73, and 80 rejected in view of Krambrock. Without acquiescence to the propriety of this rejection, and in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants hereby submit a terminal disclaimer. Applicants therefore request withdrawal of the double patenting rejection.

Applicants also submit herewith an Information Disclosure Transmittal and Form 1449 listing a number of references made of record in copending Application No. 10/806,563, which have not been made of record in this application. Applicants request consideration of the listed references and notation on the Form 1449 indicating the Examiner's consideration thereof.

Applicants submit that the claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance and request notification to that effect in the form of a Notice of Allowability.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Cross
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 32,406

Tel: (410) 531-4518
W. R. Grace & Co.-Conn.
7500 Grace Drive
Columbia, Maryland 21044